



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,737	01/16/2004	Jeffrey P. Snover	MS1-1902US	6905
22801	7590	09/07/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			ZHEN, LI B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,737

Applicant(s)

SNOVER ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/12/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 28 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention as a whole must be useful and accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-

02. Examiner suggests that claim 19 does not appear to produce a “tangible result”.

Claim 19 recites instantiating an object and populating the property of the object “if the type is identified within a list of known object types”. Therefore, the instantiating of an object and populating a property of the object is not always done. Since the instantiating of an object and populating a property of the object may or may not occur, the claim given its broadest reasonable interpretation could be interpreted such that the process for instantiating of an object and populating the property is not performed.

Claim 19, absent the steps of instantiating an object and populating a property of the object, only receives a serialized package. It is suggested that receiving a serialized

Art Unit: 2194

package without performing additional processing is nothing more than receiving data and does not produce a tangible result.

Claims 1 – 25 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 7, lines 1 – 24, the medium is not limited to storage medium embodiments, instead being defined as including both storage medium embodiments (e.g., RAM, ROM, EEPROM, flash memory, CD-ROM, DVD, magnetic tapes, computer hard drives) and transmission medium embodiments (e.g., carrier wave, wireless media such as acoustic, RF, infrared and other wireless media). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. To overcome this type of 101 rejection the claims need to be amended to include only the physical computer media (e.g., storage media) and not a transmission media or other intangible or non-functional media.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1 – 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039964 to Russell et al. [hereinafter Russell].**

6. As to claim 1, Russell teaches at least one computer-readable medium [p. 8, paragraph 0096] having computer executable instructions that provide a method for transferring computer-readable objects [p. 5, paragraph 0071] across a remote boundary [p. 7, paragraph 0088], the method comprising:

decomposing an object [complex object 500 that needs to be serialized; p. 5, paragraph 0063] of a first type [(top-level) JavaBean being serialized; p. 6, paragraph 0079 and p. 4, paragraph 0057] into an hierarchy of at least one sub-component [A child element 930 is generated for the top-level class of the object being serialized; p. 6, paragraph 0080] based on a list of known object types [type mappings; p. paragraph 0077], each sub-component comprising a known object associated with one of the known object types [serializer next needs to serialize an instance of AccountTransactions class, the type mappings will be available; p. 6, paragraph 0077];

serializing the known objects into a serialized package [entire complex object has been marshalled, the result is a serialized object as shown at 540; p., paragraph 0057];
and

transmitting the serialized package to a remote entity [Message 1015 is then sent through the network 1020, 1025, and then reaches the target Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraphs 0087 and 0088 and p. 3, paragraph 0043].

7. As to claim 26, this is a system claims that corresponds to product claim 1; note the rejection to claim 1 above, which also meets the limitations of this system claim.

Art Unit: 2194

Russell also teaches the system comprising a processor [p. 8, paragraph 0097] and memory [p. 8, paragraph 0096].

8. As to claim 2, Russell teaches the list identifies the first type as one of the known object types [using selected ones of the stored type mappings when the serialization process is subsequently invoked for the determined object; p. 2, paragraph 0018 and p. 6, paragraph 0077].

9. As to claim 3, Russell teaches at least one sub-component comprises an unknown object having a type unidentified within the list [a "missing" type mapping that causes an exception during serialization is programmatically resolved; p. 2, paragraph 0036].

10. As to claim 4, Russell teaches the decomposing an object further comprises decomposing the unknown object into another level of sub-components based on the list [A recursive process is then invoked to serialize an instance of this class. Once the entire complex object has been marshalled, the result is a serialized object as shown at 540; p. 4, paragraph 0057].

11. As to claim 5, Russell teaches a first process [object-based client code; p. 3, paragraph 0048] on a system transmits the serialized package [p. 4, paragraph 0057] and the remote entity comprises another process [Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraph 0088] on the system [client/server networks; p. 3, paragraph 0043].

Art Unit: 2194

12. As to claim 6, Russell teaches a first process [object-based client code; p. 3, paragraph 0048] on a system transmits the serialized package [p. 4, paragraph 0057] and the remote entity comprises another process [Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraph 0088] on another system [client/server networks; p. 3, paragraph 0043].

13. As to claim 7, Russell teaches a first application [object-based client code; p. 3, paragraph 0048] domain [client/server networks; p. 3, paragraph 0043] executing within a process transmits the serialized package [p. 4, paragraph 0057] and the remote entity comprises another application domain [client/server networks; p. 3, paragraph 0043] within the process [Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraph 0088].

14. As to claim 8, Russell teaches the hierarchy comprises a property bag ["mappings" element 800 contains a child "map" element for each mapping being generated for this JavaBean; p. 6, paragraph 0074].

15. As to claim 11, Russell teaches the property bag comprises a plurality of entries ["mappings" element 800 contains a child "map" element for each mapping; p. 6, paragraph 0074], each entry being associated with one of the sub-components [class name in the example is "AccountTransactions"; p. 6, paragraph 0075] and having a first field for storing a name ["qname" attribute; p. 6, paragraph 0075] associated with the sub-component [name of the class; p. 6, paragraph 0075], a second field for storing a value associated with the sub-component [values of these attributes are also generated by parsing the exception and locating the class name; p. 6, paragraph 0075], and a third

field for storing a type associated with the sub-component [a "javaType" attribute; p. 6, paragraph 0075].

16. As to claim 13, Russell teaches negotiating the list by accepting a plurality of object types received from a first process [added to a mapping registry], the accepted object types becoming known object types identified within the list [programmatically-generated mappings are automatically added to a mapping registry; p. 2, paragraph 0037].

17. As to claim 14, Russell teaches negotiating the list by receiving an identifier for a file and having the list include object types identified within the file [encodingStyle" attribute where that default value identifies the SOAP encoding schema; p. 6, paragraph 0074].

18. As to claim 16, Russell teaches limiting the hierarchy of sub-components [Each map element has six attributes; p. 6, paragraph 0074] by defining a property set that identifies individual properties of the object [attributes; p. 6, paragraph 0080], wherein decomposing the object comprises decomposing the identified individual properties of the object [For the object to be serialized, the values of a "qname" attribute and of a "javaType" attribute are programmatically generated; p. 6, paragraph 0075].

19. As to claim 17, Russell teaches limiting the hierarchy of sub-components by identifying a specified property within the object [a type attribute 932 is set to match the name of the class being serialized; p. 6, paragraph 0080], wherein decomposing the

Art Unit: 2194

object comprises decomposing the specified property [element is created for the endDate field, as shown at 970, where this element has a type attribute 971; p. 7, paragraph 0085].

20. As to claim 27, this is a system claims that corresponds to product claim 5; note the rejection to claim 5 above, which also meets the limitations of this system claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182308 to Ernst et al. [hereinafter Ernst].

23. As to claim 9, Russell teaches property bag [p. 6, paragraph 0074] but does not teach the property bag comprising a hash table.

However, Ernst teaches transforming data from one format to another [p. 5, paragraph 0056] based on data schema [p. 5, paragraph 0057], a property bag [a set of properties of that object; p. 4, paragraph 0039] comprising a hash table [lookup table; p. 4, paragraph 0039].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ernst and Russell because Ernst's teachings allows content schema evolution while maintaining operation based on already stored content data [p. paragraph 0011 of Ernst] and simplifies maintenance and takes some burden of the setup phase [p. 10, paragraph 0118 of Ernst].

24. As to claim 10, Russell does not teach a key for each entry in the hash table comprises a name for the sub-component associated with the entry.

However, Ernst teaches a key [ID] for each entry in the hash table [selecting from the property tables all rows with the object ID associated to the content object; p. 11, paragraph 0132] comprises a name for the sub-component associated with the entry [properties are internally represented by identifiers; p. 11, paragraph 0128].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ernst and Russell because Ernst's teachings provide unique invariable identifiers for the content types and/or properties [p. 5, paragraph 0051 of Ernst].

25. As to claim 12, Russell does not teach version numbers for an object type list.

However, Ernst teaches negotiating [pp. 4 – 5, paragraph 0047] the known object types identified within list by receiving a version number of a first list [label referring to a content schema version; p. 4, paragraph 0043] available to a first process [a label is used to record a set of versions that fulfill some interobject integrity constraints; p. 4, paragraph 0043], comparing the version number to another version number of a second

Art Unit: 2194

list available to the remote entity [a version is directly linked from many sources, a modified version would only be linked after changing all referring resources; p. 4, paragraph 0044], and determining the list based on the comparison [generating new version of these resources; p. 4, paragraph 0044].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ernst and Russell because Ernst's teachings provide a unified approach to handle content schema evolution and content generation [p. 6, paragraph 0061 of Ernst].

26. Claims 15, 18 – 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0154978 to Albornoz et al. [hereinafter Albornoz].

27. As to claim 15, Russell does not teach limiting the hierarchy of sub-components by specifying a pre-determined depth for the hierarchy.

However, Albornoz teaches Serialization of the objects within an XML data structure API class [p. 3, paragraph 0031], hierarchical data structures with one or more layers of sub-elements [p. 4, paragraph 0043], limiting the hierarchy of sub-components by specifying a pre-determined depth for the hierarchy [a minimum number of elements in the array is not met and/or the maximum number of elements in the array is exceeded; p. 7, paragraph 0062], wherein decomposing the object comprises decomposing the object to the pre-determined depth [If the maxOccurs for the current sub-element is determined to not be greater than one; p. 7, paragraph 0067].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Albornoz and Russell because Albornoz's teaching raises an error if a maximum number of elements is exceeded or minimum number of elements is not met [p. 7, paragraph 0062 of Albornoz]. The raised error would stop processing when the maximum number of elements is exceeded and this would prevent out of memory errors.

28. As to claim 18, Russell as modified by Albornoz teaches limiting the hierarchy of sub-components by specifying a pre-determined number [a minimum number of elements in the array is not met and/or the maximum number of elements in the array is exceeded; p. 7, paragraph 0062 of Albornoz] that limits the known objects that are serialized into the serialized package by the number [If the maxOccurs for the current sub-element is determined to not be greater than one; p. 7, paragraph 0067 of Albornoz]. As to the motivation for combining Russell and Albornoz, see the rejection to claim 15 above.

29. As to claim 19, Russell teaches the invention substantially as claimed including at least one computer-readable medium [p. 8, paragraph 0096] having computer executable instructions that provide a method for receiving a package representing a computer-readable object transmitted across a remote boundary [p. 7, paragraph 0088], the method comprising:

receiving a serialized package [serialize the objects to be passed as input to the Web service so that these objects and their data can be passed to the Web service; p. 3, paragraph 0048] from a remote entity [client code, p. 3, paragraph 0048];

identifying a hierarchy of sub-components ["mappings" element 800 contains a child "map" element for each mapping being generated for this JavaBean; p. 6, paragraph 0074], the hierarchy representing an object of a first type [type mappings; p. paragraph 0077];

for each sub-component: identifying a type associated with the sub-component [mappings generated according to the present invention may be used when deserializing messages (i.e., when transforming flattened, or non-hierarchical, data structures back into their object format); p. 2, paragraph 0038];

if the type is identified within a list of known object types [deserialization leverages the mappings that were previously created and stored in the mappings registry; p. 7, paragraph 0092], instantiating an object of the type [deserialization process uses the stored type mappings to generate an object version of the message; p. 2, paragraph 0021]. Although Russell teaches the invention substantially, Russell does not specifically teach populating at least one property of the object with information obtained from within the serialized package.

However, Albornoz teaches serialization of the objects within an XML data structure API class [p. 3, paragraph 0031], hierarchical data structures with one or more layers of sub-elements [p. 4, paragraph 0043], instantiating an object of a type and populating at least one property of the object with information obtained from within the

serialized package [creates, at step 1004, an object that corresponds to the received schema; p. 7, paragraph 0065].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Albornoz and Russell because Albornoz's teaching provides easy manipulation within dynamic languages of data structures that reflect the structure of content models defined by XML schemas [pp. 5 – 6, paragraph 0053 of Albornoz].

30. As to claim 20, Russell teaches the list includes the first type as one of the known object types [deserialization leverages the mappings that were previously created and stored in the mappings registry; p. 7, paragraph 0092].

31. As to claim 21, Russell teaches the at least one sub-component comprises an unknown object having a type unidentified within the list [a "missing" type mapping; p. 2, paragraph 0036 and p. 4, paragraph 0059].

32. As to claim 22, Russell teaches a first process [Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraph 0088] on a system receives the serialized package [p. 4, paragraph 0057] and the remote entity comprises another process [object-based client code; p. 3, paragraph 0048] on the system [client/server; p. 3, paragraph 0043].

33. As to claim 23, Russell teaches a first process [Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraph 0088] on a system receives the serialized package [p. 4, paragraph 0057]

Art Unit: 2194

and the remote entity comprises another process [object-based client code; p. 3, paragraph 0048] on another system [client/server; p. 3, paragraph 0043].

34. As to claim 24, Russell teaches a first application domain [client/server networks; p. 3, paragraph 0043] executing within a process [Web service 1030; p. 7, paragraph 0088] receives the serialized package [p. 4, paragraph 0057] and the remote entity [object-based client code; p. 3, paragraph 0048] comprises another application domain [client/server networks; p. 3, paragraph 0043] within the process.

35. As to claim 25, Russell teaches the serialized package comprises an XML document [SOAP XML format; p. 4, paragraph 0057].

36. As to claim 28, Russell teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system further comprising:

receiving a serialized package [serialize the objects to be passed as input to the Web service so that these objects and their data can be passed to the Web service; p. 3, paragraph 0048] from a remote entity [client code, p. 3, paragraph 0048];

identifying a hierarchy of sub-components ["mappings" element 800 contains a child "map" element for each mapping being generated for this JavaBean; p. 6, paragraph 0074], the hierarchy representing an object of a first type [type mappings; p. paragraph 0077];

for each sub-component: identifying a type associated with the sub-component [mappings generated according to the present invention may be used when

Art Unit: 2194

deserializing messages (i.e., when transforming flattened, or non-hierarchical, data structures back into their object format); p. 2, paragraph 0038];

if the type is identified within a list of known object types [deserialization leverages the mappings that were previously created and stored in the mappings registry; p. 7, paragraph 0092], instantiating an object of the type [deserialization process uses the stored type mappings to generate an object version of the message; p. 2, paragraph 0021]. Although Russell teaches the invention substantially, Russell does not specifically teach populating at least one property of the object with information obtained from within the serialized package.

However, Albornoz teaches serialization of the objects within an XML data structure API class [p. 3, paragraph 0031], hierarchical data structures with one or more layers of sub-elements [p. 4, paragraph 0043], instantiating an object of a type and populating at least one property of the object with information obtained from within the serialized package [creates, at step 1004, an object that corresponds to the received schema; p. 7, paragraph 0065].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Albornoz and Russell because Albornoz's teaching provides easy manipulation within dynamic languages of data structures that reflect the structure of content models defined by XML schemas [pp. 5 – 6, paragraph 0053 of Albornoz].

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2194

37. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0191803 discloses a system to receive a serialized message including a target object that is associated with at least one member object.

U.S. Patent No. 7,058,645 discloses a system for mapping of a first native data type instance to a second native type.

"Object Serialization and Deserialization Using XML" discloses implementing database serialization and deserialization methods that can be used to replicate or migrate objects across the network.

"Object Serialization Analysis and Comparison in Java and .NET" discloses performance and size analysis of serialization mechanisms build into Java and .NET platform.

CONTACT INFORMATION

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2194
September 4, 2006

LBZ

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Li B. Zhen', is located below the typed name and date.